UNITED STATES D	
AT TACOMA	
KEITH E. BERRY,	CASE NO. C10-5711RJB/JRC
Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
v.	MOTION TO COMPEL DISCOVERY
CITY OF TACOMA, et al.,	
Defendants.	
This 42 H C C & 1002 sivil rights setion h	os boon mafamued to the undersianed Manietmete
Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 030(0)(1)(A) and (B) and Local Wagistrate Judges Rules WJR 1,	
MJR 3, and MJR 4.	
The matter is before the court on plaintiff's motion to compel discovery (ECF No. 15).	
Defendants have responded and argue the motion should be denied because it has not been thirty	
days since plaintiff provided additional information needed. Defendant's position is that the	
0 motion is untimely and unfounded (ECF No. 19).	
Defendants' argument is persuasive. For the reasons set forth in defendants' response,	
the motion to compel is DENIED.	
DATED this 18 th day of January, 2011.	
	Though waters
	J. Richard Creatura United States Magistrate Judge
	WESTERN DISTRICT AT TACK KEITH E. BERRY, Plaintiff, v. CITY OF TACOMA, et al., Defendants. This 42 U.S.C. § 1983 civil rights action had be successed by the second of the second